

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the case. All claims stand rejected. In the present submission, claims 1-10 have been amended. Applicants have also amended the specification to correct typographical errors. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 6 for the following informalities: the Examiner suggested that the term " $\delta(\Delta t)\delta(i,j)$ " in the claims should be written without the " $\cdot$ " between the two delta terms. Applicant respectfully submits that the term " $\delta(\Delta t)\delta(i,j)$ " in each of claims 1 and 6 is correctly stated. Specifically, equation (1) on page 3, line 24, of Applicant's specification recites the relationship of the two delta terms as including a dot in between to represent a multiplication operation. Equation (5) on page 7, line 15, of Applicant's specification also states the equation for the two delta terms but the dot was inadvertently omitted.

In the present submission, Applicant has amended both the specification and claims 1 and 6 to use an enlarged dot " $\bullet$ " to represent the multiplication operation. Applicant submits that the present amendment overcomes the Examiner's objection. Withdrawal of the claim objection is respectfully requested.

§112 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In the present submission, Applicant has amendment claims 1-10 to overcome the §112, second paragraph, rejection. Specifically, the claims have been amended as follows:

Regarding claims 1 and 6, the variables i, j and t are now clearly defined. Support for claim 1 can be found in Applicant's specification, page 3, line 23, to page 4, line 6, describing the use of variables i and j as index numbers, and page 6, line 15, to page 7, line 4, and Figure 4 describing the variable t as representing time. The term "signal transmission channel" has been amended to be consistent throughout claims 1 and 6. The second occurrence of the term

"a convolution signal" has been amended to "a composite signal" in accordance with Applicant's specification, page 8, lines 4-8. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to clarify the limitation of "the transmitted signal."

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 have been amended to clarify the specific reference to sequences PN(t;k). Claims 3 and 8 have also been amended to clarify the reference to the "signal transmission channel."

Applicant respectfully submits that the present amendments overcome the §112, second paragraph, rejection of the claims. Withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Allowance Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 1-10 would be allowable when the §112, second paragraph, rejection of the claims is overcome. By the above amendment, the claims have been amended to overcome the §112 rejection. Passage of the present case to allowance is respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSION

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-10 have been amended to place the claims in condition for allowance. The amendments to the specification made herein deal only with correcting clerical errors and form. No new matter has been entered. Accordingly, the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner would like to discuss any aspect of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 382-0480.

#### Certification of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Signature

January 10, 2005

Date

PATENT LAW  
GROUP LLP  
2635 N. FIRST ST.,  
SUITE 220  
SAN JOSE, CA 95134  
(408) 382-0480  
FAX (408) 382-0481

Respectfully submitted,

Carmen C. Cook  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 42,433